

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 14-31, and 33-34 are currently pending. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 12-13 have been cancelled. Applicants acknowledge and appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 10-11, 14-31, and 33-34 are allowed and claim 12 contains allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Examiner also indicated that claims 13, 25, 29-31, 33, and 34 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for his time during the telephone conference of February 24, 2005. During the telephone conference, Applicants sought clarification of the status of several of the pending claims. In particular, Applicants asked the status of claim 13, which the Examiner has indicated is both allowable and rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Harris (U.S. Patent No. 4,498,230). The Examiner indicated that claim 13 is rejected. Rather, than attempting to answer all of the questions, the Examiner asked that we respond to the Office action as it is written.

In light of our discussions with the Examiner, Applicants note that claims 25, 29, 30, and 33 were rewritten in independent form in our response dated October 27, 2004. As such, claims 25, 29, 30, and 33 are allowable, as indicated by the Examiner. In addition, claim 31 depends from claim 30 and claim 34 depends from claim 33. As such, claims 31 and 34 are also allowable.

The pending Office action includes an objection of the specification as failing to provide antecedent basis for the first and second distal edge. Applicants corrected this objection in the Response dated October 27, 2004. Specifically, Applicants amended the claims to remove the terms "first distal edge" and "second distal edge" and replaced them

with "first distal surface" and "second distal surface." In addition, the final full paragraph of page 4, beginning on line 18 and ending on line 30 was amended to clearly define the distal surfaces. Thus, Applicants believe this objection has been traversed and respectfully request its withdrawal.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 8, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harris. In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 6, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris in view of McDonald (U.S. Patent No. 4,603,273).

Applicants have traversed the rejection of claim 1 by amending claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable claim 12, which depended from claim 1. As such claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are also allowable. Applicants have cancelled claim 13, thus rendering its rejection moot.

The present Office action includes a rejection of claims 26-28 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald. However, the Examiner has also indicated that claims 26-28 are allowed. In addition, claim 32 was cancelled in the Response filed October 27, 2004, thereby rendering any rejection moot.

Applicants believe the rejection of claims 26-28 and 32 is an error and respectfully request that it be withdrawn. If the rejection is not an error, Applicants point out that, claim 26 defines a method of assembling an electric machine that includes, among other things, fitting a first housing portion over the stator. The first housing portion includes a first tab that extends from a first housing interior. The first fitting act includes partially covering the generally cylindrical surface with the first housing portion and disposing the first tab adjacent the first end of the stator. The method also includes fitting a second housing portion over the stator. The second housing portion includes a second tab that extends from a second housing

interior. The second fitting act includes partially covering the generally cylindrical surface with the second housing portion and disposing the second tab adjacent the second end of the stator. As noted by the Examiner, and discussed in our Response dated October 27, 2004, McDonald does not teach or suggest, among other things, a first tab disposed adjacent the first end of the stator that extends from a first housing interior and a second tab disposed adjacent the second end of the stator that extends from a second housing interior. Rather, McDonald discloses an electric machine that includes a tab 40 that extends from the exterior of the end bell 28. In addition, there is no mention of a second tab extending from the end bell 26.

In light of the foregoing, McDonald does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 26. As such, claim 26 is allowable. In addition, claims 27-28 depend from claim 26 and are allowable for these and other reasons.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-11, 14-31, and 33-34 are allowable.

The undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Otterlee
Reg. No. 48,652

Docket No.: 010121-9897-00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108

(414) 271-6560